arXiv:1604.00040v2 [math.FA] 4 Apr 2016

A NOTE ON THE BOHNENBLUST–HILLE INEQUALITY FOR MULTILINEAR FORMS

J. SANTOS AND T. VELANGA

Abstract. The general versions of the Bohnenblust–Hille inequality for m-linear forms are valid for exponents $q_1, ..., q_m \in [1, 2]$. In this paper we show that a slightly different characterization is valid for $q_1, ..., q_m \in (0, \infty)$.

1. Introduction

The Bohnenblust-Hille inequality [3] asserts that for all positive integers $m \geq 1$ there is a constant $C = C(\mathbb{K},m) \geq 1$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{i_1,...,i_m=1}^{\infty} \left| T(e_{i_1}, ..., e_{i_m}) \right|^{\frac{2m}{m+1}} \right)^{\frac{m+1}{2m}} \leq C \|T\| \tag{1}$$

for all continuous m-linear forms $T : c_0 \times \cdots \times c_0 \to \mathbb{K}$, where $\mathbb{K}$ denotes the fields of real or complex scalars. This result can be generalized in some different directions. A very interesting and far reaching generalization is the following (below, $e_j^{n_j}$ means $(e_j, ..., e_j)$ repeated n_j times):

Theorem 1.1 (Albuquerque, Araújo, Nuñez, Pellegrino and Rueda)**.** *([1]) Let $1 \leq k \leq m$ and $n_1, \ldots, n_k \geq 1$ be positive integers such that $n_1 + \cdots + n_k = m$, let $q_1, \ldots, q_k \in [1, 2]$. The following assertions are equivalent :*

(I) There is a constant $C^{\mathbb{K}}_{k,q_1 \ldots q_k} \geq 1$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\infty} \left(\ldots \left(\sum_{i_{k-1}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_k=1}^{\infty} \left| T\left(e_{i_1}^{n_1}, \ldots, e_{i_k}^{n_k}\right) \right|^{q_k} \right)^{\frac{q_{k-1}}{q_k}} \right)^{\frac{q_{k-2}}{q_{k-1}}} \cdots \right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}} \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C^{\mathbb{K}}_{k,q_1 \ldots q_k} \|T\|$$

for all continuous m-linear forms $T : c_0 \times \cdots \times c_0 \to \mathbb{K}$.

(II) $\frac{1}{q_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{q_k} \leq \frac{k+1}{2}$.

When $k = m$ we recover a characterization of Albuquerque et al. [2], and finally when $q_1 = \cdots = q_m = \frac{2m}{m+1}$ we recover the Bohnenblust–Hille inequality.

Key words and phrases. Bohnenblust–Hille inequality.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 47A63; Secondary 47A07.

J. Santos was supported by CNPq, grant 303122/2015-3.

In this note we present an extension of the above theorem to $q_1, ..., q_m \in (0, \infty)$. In particular, we remark that in general the condition $\frac{1}{q_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{q_k} \leq \frac{k+1}{2}$ is not enough to prove (I) for $q_1, ..., q_m \in (0, \infty)$. For instance, if $m = k = 3$ and $(q_1, q_2, q_3) = \left(1, \frac{18}{10}, 3\right)$ we have $\frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2} + \frac{1}{q_3} < \frac{3+1}{2}$ but, as we shall see, (I) is not true. We prove the following:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $1 \leq k \leq m$ and $n_1, \ldots, n_k \geq 1$ be positive integers such that $n_1 + \cdots + n_k = m$, let $q_1, \ldots, q_k \in (0, \infty)$. The following assertions are equivalent:*

(i) There is a constant $C^{\mathbb{K}}_{k,q_1 \ldots q_k} \geq 1$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\infty} \left(\ldots \left(\sum_{i_{k-1}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_k=1}^{\infty} \left| T\left(e_{i_1}^{n_1}, \ldots, e_{i_k}^{n_k}\right)\right|^{q_k} \right)^{\frac{q_{k-1}}{q_k}} \right)^{\frac{q_{k-2}}{q_{k-1}}} \cdots \right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}} \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C^{\mathbb{K}}_{k,q_1 \ldots q_k} \|T\|$$

for all continuous m-linear forms $T : c_0 \times \cdots \times c_0 \to \mathbb{K}$.

(ii) $\sum\limits_{j \in A} \frac{1}{q_j} \leq \frac{card(A)+1}{2}$ for all $A \subset \{1, ..., k\}$.

2. The proof

We begin by recalling the following theorem (in fact, as we mentioned before, this is precisely Theorem 1.1 with $k = m$):

Theorem 2.1 (Albuquerque, Bayart, Pellegrino and Seoane)**.** *Let $m \geq 1$, let $q_1, ..., q_m \in [1, 2]$. The following assertions are equivalent:*

(a) There is a constant $C^{\mathbb{K}}_{q_1 \ldots q_m} \geq 1$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\infty} \left(\ldots \left(\sum_{i_{m-1}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{\infty} |T(e_{i_1}, ..., e_{i_m})|^{q_m} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-2}}{q_{m-1}}} \cdots \right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}} \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C^{\mathbb{K}}_{q_1 \ldots q_m} \|T\|$$

for all continuous m-linear forms $T : c_0 \times \cdots \times c_0 \to \mathbb{K}$.

(b) $\frac{1}{q_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{q_m} \leq \frac{m+1}{2}$.

Our first step is to extend the Theorem 2.1 as follows:

Theorem 2.2. *Let $m \geq 1$, let $q_1, ..., q_m \in (0, \infty)$. The following assertions are equivalent:*

(A) There is a constant $C^{\mathbb{K}}_{q_1 \ldots q_m} \geq 1$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\infty} \left(\ldots \left(\sum_{i_{m-1}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{\infty} |T(e_{i_1}, ..., e_{i_m})|^{q_m} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-2}}{q_{m-1}}} \cdots \right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}} \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C^{\mathbb{K}}_{q_1 \ldots q_m} \|T\|$$

for all continuous m-linear forms $T : c_0 \times \cdots \times c_0 \to \mathbb{K}$.

(B) $\sum\limits_{j\in A}\frac{1}{q_j}\leq\frac{card(A)+1}{2}$ *for all* $A\subset\{1,...,m\}$.

To prove Theorem 2.2 we need to prove the following elementary lemma:

Lemma 2.3. *If* $q_1,...,q_m\in(0,\infty)$ *and*

$$\sum_{j\in A}\frac{1}{q_j}\leq\frac{card(A)+1}{2} \tag{2}$$

for all $A\subset\{1,...,m\}$*, then*

$$\frac{1}{\min\{q_1,2\}}+\cdots+\frac{1}{\min\{q_m,2\}}\leq\frac{m+1}{2}.$$

Proof. Given $q_1,...,q_m\in(0,\infty)$, consider $A_1=\{j:q_j\leq 2\}$ and $A_2=\{j:q_j>2\}$. Then, by (2), we have

$$\frac{1}{\min\{q_1,2\}}+\cdots+\frac{1}{\min\{q_m,2\}}=\sum_{j\in A_1}\frac{1}{q_j}+\sum_{j\in A_2}\frac{1}{2}\leq\frac{card(A_1)+1}{2}+\frac{card(A_2)}{2}=\frac{m+1}{2}.$$

□

Now we can prove Theorem 2.2. Let us begin by proving that (A) implies (B). The proof of the case $A=\{1,...,k\}$ for $k<m$ illustrates the argument. Let

$$T_k:c_0\times\overset{k\text{ times}}{\cdots}\times c_0\to\mathbb{K}$$

be the k-linear form given by the Kahane–Salem–Zygmund inequality (see [2, Lemma 6.1]). Then, define

$$T_m:c_0\times\overset{m\text{ times}}{\cdots}\times c_0\to\mathbb{K}$$

by

$$T_m(x^{(1)},...,x^{(m)})=T_k(x^{(1)},...,x^{(k)})x_1^{(k+1)}...x_1^{(m)}.$$

It is obvious that $\|T_m\|=\|T_k\|$ and by the Kahane–Salem–Zygmund inequality we have $\|T_k\|\leq Cn^{\frac{k+1}{2}}$ for some $C>0$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
n^{\frac{1}{q_1}+\cdots+\frac{1}{q_k}} &= \left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\infty}\left(...\left(\sum_{i_{k-1}=1}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{i_k=1}^{\infty}|T_k(e_{i_1},...,e_{i_k})|^{q_k}\right)^{\frac{q_{k-1}}{q_k}}\right)^{\frac{q_{k-2}}{q_{k-1}}}\cdots\right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}}\right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}}\\
&= \left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\infty}\left(...\left(\sum_{i_{m-1}=1}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{\infty}|T_m(e_{i_1},...,e_{i_m})|^{q_m}\right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}}\right)^{\frac{q_{m-2}}{q_{m-1}}}\cdots\right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}}\right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}}\\
&\leq C^{\mathbb{K}}_{q_1...q_m}\|T_m\|\\
&\leq C^{\mathbb{K}}_{q_1...q_m}Cn^{\frac{k+1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

since n is arbitrary, we conclude that

$$\sum_{j\in A}\frac{1}{q_j}\leq\frac{card(A)+1}{2}.$$

To prove that (B) implies (A), suppose that $\sum\limits_{j\in A}\frac{1}{q_j}\leq\frac{card(A)+1}{2}$ for all $A\subset\{1,...,m\}$; from the lemma proved above we have

$$\frac{1}{\min\{q_1,2\}}+\cdots+\frac{1}{\min\{q_m,2\}}\leq\frac{m+1}{2}.$$

Besides, by considering $A=\{k\}$ it is plain that $q_k\geq 1$. Hence $\min\{q_k,2\}\in[1,2]$ for all $k=1,...,m$ and the proof of Theorem 2.2 is now a consequence of (b)⇒(a) and of the canonical inclusion between the norms of ℓ_p spaces.

Now we can prove Theorem 1.2. Let us begin by proving that (i) implies (ii). From the proof of the main result of [1] we know that since (i) holds for all continuous m-linear forms $T_m:c_0\times\cdots\times c_0\to\mathbb{K}$, then

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\infty}\left(...\left(\sum_{i_{k-1}=1}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{i_k=1}^{\infty}|T_k\left(e_{i_1},...,e_{i_k}\right)|^{q_k}\right)^{\frac{q_{k-1}}{q_k}}\right)^{\frac{q_{k-2}}{q_{k-1}}}\cdots\right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}}\right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}}\leq C^{\mathbb{K}}_{k,q_1\ldots q_k}\|T_k\|$$

holds for all k-linear forms $T_k:c_0\times\cdots\times c_0\to\mathbb{K}$. So, from Theorem 2.2 we conclude that

$$\sum_{j\in A}\frac{1}{q_j}\leq\frac{card(A)+1}{2}$$

for all $A\subset\{1,...,k\}$.

Now we prove that (ii) implies (i). If $\sum\limits_{j\in A}\frac{1}{q_j}\leq\frac{card(A)+1}{2}$ for all $A\subset\{1,...,k\}$, from the lemma we have

$$\frac{1}{\min\{q_1,2\}}+\cdots+\frac{1}{\min\{q_k,2\}}\leq\frac{k+1}{2}.$$

Since $\min\{q_j,2\}\in[1,2]$ for all $j=1,...,k$, the proof is now a consequence of (II)⇒(I) and of the canonical inclusion between the norms of ℓ_p spaces.

References

[1] N. Albuquerque, G. Araújo, D. Nuñez-Alarcón, D. Pellegrino and P. Rueda, Bohnenblust-Hille and Hardy-Littlewood inequalities by blocks, arXiv:1409.6769 [math.FA].

[2] N. Albuquerque, F. Bayart, D. Pellegrino and J. Seoane-Sepúlveda, Sharp generalizations of the Bohnenblust–Hille inequality, J. Funct. Analysis, **266** (2014), 3726–3740.

[3] H.F. Bohnenblust and E. Hille, On the absolute convergence of Dirichlet series, Ann. of Math. (2) **32** (1931), 600–622.

Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, 58.051-900 - João Pessoa, Brazil.
E-mail address: joedsonmat@gmail.com

IMECC, UNICAMP-Universidade Estadual de Campinas, 13.083-859 - São Paulo, Brazil.

Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal de Rondônia, 76.801-059 - Porto Velho, Brazil.
E-mail address: thiagovelanga@gmail.com